

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| In re application of: <b>Brokenshire et al.</b> | § | Group Art Unit: <b>2628</b>                 |
|   | § |   |
| Serial No. <b>09/833,348</b>                    | § | Examiner: <b>Amini, Javid A.</b>            |
|   | § |   |
| Filed: <b>April 12, 2001</b>                    | § | Confirmation No.: <b>3792</b>               |
|   | § |   |
| For: <b>Method and Apparatus for</b>            | § | Attorney Docket No.: <b>AUS920010010US1</b> |
| <b>Generating Gamma Corrected</b>               | § |   |
| <b>Antialiased Lines</b>                        | § |   |

35525

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**REPLY BRIEF IN REPLY TO REVISED EXAMINER'S ANSWER (37 C.F.R. 41.41)**

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Revised Examiner's Answer mailed on October 30, 2008. The substance of this Reply Brief is identical to the Reply Brief filed on June 27, 2006, replying to the Examiner's Answer filed April 27, 2006, and to the Reply Brief filed on January 11, 2007, replying to the Revised Examiner's Answer filed on November 14, 2006, however, is being resubmitted to specifically reply to the Revised Examiner's Answer mailed on October 30, 2008.

No fees are believed to be required to file a Reply Brief. If any fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

## **RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S REMARKS**

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Anticipation, Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-23 (Group A)**

On page 3 of the Revised Examiner's Answer dated October 30, 2008, the Examiner asserts that claim 22 is the broadest independent claim in the application because it does not contain the adverb "only" as recited in other independent claims on appeal herein. Appellants respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 recite that "the gamma correction is applied only to the primitives defining lines", and claim 20 recites, using somewhat different terminology, that "the gamma correction unit only generates a gamma corrected value for pixels that are part of a line". Appellants submit that claim 22 is of generally corresponding scope as the other independent claims in this regard, although it also describes this aspect of the invention using somewhat different terminology.

Claim 22 on appeal herein is as follows:

22. A method in a data processing system for antialiasing lines for display, the method comprising:  
generating graphics data for display;  
determining whether the graphics data comprises a line;  
if the graphics data comprises a line, sending the graphics data to an adapter;  
applying a gamma correction to the graphics data to form an antialiased line.

Claim 22 recites that it is determined whether graphics data generated for display comprises a line, and sending the graphics data to an adapter if the graphics data comprises a line. A gamma correction is then applied to the graphics data to form an antialiased line.

From this terminology of claim 22, it is clear that only graphics data that comprises a line is sent to an adapter, and that a gamma correction is applied only to graphics data that comprises a line. If the graphics data did not comprise only a line, it would comprise a region that included a line, and applying a gamma correction to a region of graphics data would not form an antialiased line as required by claim 22, but would affect the entire region of the display.

Accordingly, Appellants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in contending that claim 22 is the broadest independent claim merely because it does not specifically include the adverb "only".

Appellants instead submit that claim 22 is of comparable scope as other independent claims on appeal herein, at least with respect to that aspect of the invention, and it is respectfully requested that the Board so find.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, and for the reasons set forth in detail in the Appeal Brief dated February 19, 2004, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-23 on appeal herein patentably distinguish over Warren, considered alone or in view of Deering, and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to not sustain the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action and in the Revised Examiner's Answer.

/Gerald H. Glanzman/  
Gerald H. Glanzman  
Reg. No. 25,035  
**YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**  
PO Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777